Spin polarization of electrons by ultra-intense lasers

D. Del Sorbo,[1] D. Seipt,[2,3] T. G. Blackburn,[4] A. G. R. Thomas,[3,2] C. D. Murphy,[1] J. G. Kirk,[5] and C. P. Ridgers[1]

[1] *York Plasma Institute, Physics Department, University of York, YO10 5DQ, United Kingdom*
[2] *Cockcroft Institute, Daresbury Laboratory, Warrington WA4 4AD, United Kingdom*
[3] *Department of Physics, Lancaster University Lancaster, LA1 4YB, United Kingdom*
[4] *Department of Physics, Chalmers University of Technology, SE-41296 Gothenburg, Sweden*
[5] *Max Planck Institut für Kernphysik, Saupfercheckweg 1, D-69117, Heidelberg, Germany*

In a strong magnetic field, ultra-relativistic electrons or positrons undergo spin flip transitions as they radiate, preferentially spin polarizing in one direction – the Sokolov-Ternov effect. Here we show that this effect could occur very rapidly (in less than 10 fs) in high intensity ($I \gtrsim 10^{23}$ W/cm^2) laser-matter interactions, resulting in a high degree of electron spin polarization (70%-90%).

arXiv:1702.03203v1 [physics.plasm-ph] 2 Feb 2017

Current high-intensity lasers can focus light up to 2×10^{22} W/cm^2 [1]. Such intense light has potential applications ranging from compact particle accelerators [2] to x-ray source generation [3]. At the intensities accessible by the soon to be completed Extreme Light Infrastructure [4] ($I \gtrsim 10^{23}$ W/cm^2), laser-matter interactions are predicted to reach a new regime inferred to exist in extreme astrophysical environments, such as pulsar [5] and active black hole magnetospheres [6]. Matter in the laser focus is rapidly ionized creating a plasma whose behavior is characterized by the interplay of relativistic plasma kinetics and non-linear quantum electrodynamic (QED) processes [3]. For brevity we describe this new regime as a QED-plasma.

In order to understand the dynamics of QED-plasmas, it is necessary to have an accurate description of the micro-dynamics of particles undergoing QED processes in the strong background field of the laser. Standard treatments average over the spin degree of freedom [7–9]. However, Sokolov and Ternov demonstrated that ultra-relativistic electrons and positrons spin polarize in a strong magnetic field, after a characteristic time $t_{\rm ST}$ [10]. For example, a 1 GeV energy electron, subjected to a 10 kG constant magnetic field, has a 92.4% of probability of being polarized with spin antiparallel to the magnetic field after 1 hour (measured in Ref.[11]). For electrons, spin polarization occurs because spin flip transitions from a state with the spin aligned with the magnetic field to one antialigned are favorable compared to the reverse process (and vice versa for positrons).

In this letter we show that electron spin polarization can also occur in the electromagnetic fields of next-generation lasers. In particular, we study the case of electrons orbiting in a rotating electric field – a configuration that may be realized at the magnetic node of two colliding, circularly-polarised laser pulses. The spin polarization of the electrons by high-intensity lasers can occur very rapidly, we predict on the femtosecond time scale.

The important QED processes that strongly affect the macroscopic plasma dynamics, in the QED-plasma regime, are [3, 12, 13]: (i) incoherent hard photon emission (gamma-rays) by electrons and positrons (non-linear Compton scattering), with the resulting radiation-reaction strongly modifying the dynamics of the latter [14]; (ii) pair creation by the emitted gamma-ray photons, in the macroscopic electromagnetic fields in the laser-produced plasma (the multi-photon Breit-Wheeler process). For example: non-linear Compton scattering and the resulting radiation can lead to almost complete laser absorption [15, 16]; pair cascades (where pairs emit further hard-photons, which generate even more pairs), can lead to the creation of critical density pair plasmas that could affect particle acceleration [17–19]. It is therefore essential to correctly describe the QED processes.

In order to describe the QED processes in the QED-plasma regime we make use of the Furry picture [20]: the laser fields are treated as a classical background, 'dressing' the electron and positron states. Hard photons emitted by the electrons and positrons (gamma-ray photons) are treated as a quantized field in perturbation theory. Interactions between the 'dressed' particles and gamma-ray photons are computed by expanding the S-matrix [3] in powers of the fine structure constant [13, 21]. 'Dressed' particles perform quantum transitions (such as spin flip or pair creation) forbidden in the absence of the background fields because the conservation laws are assured by the latter. For laser intensities $I \gg 10^{18}$ W/cm^2 the well-known rates of photon emission and pair production in constant, crossed electric and magnetic fields [22] may be used.

Up to now, all attempts to describe the effect of hard photon emission on QED-plasma dynamics have been performed by averaging over electron spin effects [18, 23–26]. We include the spin [27] according to the standard discussion of the Sokolov-Ternov (ST) effect in a constant magnetic field [10]: the electron population is divided into two, characterized by their spin component parallel ($s = \uparrow = +1$) or antiparallel ($s = \downarrow = -1$) to the magnetic field. The temporal evolution of the electron population with spin antiparallel to the magnetic field (density $n^\downarrow$) is given by

$$\frac{d}{d\tau} n^\downarrow(t) = \frac{dN^{\uparrow\downarrow}}{d\tau} n^\uparrow(t) - \frac{dN^{\downarrow\uparrow}}{d\tau} n^\downarrow(t), \qquad (1)$$



(a) (b)

FIG. 1. The different components of Eq. (2), normalized to the unpolarized rate $dN/d\tau$, as functions of η; η is represented on a logarithmic scale while the normalized rates are plotted on both linear (a) and logarithmic (b) scales, in order to emphasize differences. The legend is the same for both figures and is shown in (b).

where $\tau = t/\gamma$ is the electron's proper time with the Lorentz factor γ. The rate of photon emission $dN^{ss'}/d\tau$ is summed over photon polarization states, and pair production has been neglected in (1). An analogue relation holds for the population with spin parallel to the magnetic field ($n^{\uparrow}$).

Now we consider the case of electrons at the magnetic node of the standing wave set up by two counter-propagating, circularly-polarized plane waves. The electric field at the magnetic node, $\boldsymbol{E}$, rotates with constant amplitude [28]. Consequently, an electron subjected to $\boldsymbol{E}$ rotates in the plane perpendicular to $\boldsymbol{E}\times\boldsymbol{\beta}$, where $\beta = v/c \simeq 1$ is its normalized velocity in the laboratory frame.

In order to describe the spin dynamics in a rotating electric field within the ST approach we need to use a proper non-precessing spin basis, i.e. a direction u_μ along which the spin 4-vector S^μ is such that $d(S^\mu u_\mu)/d\tau = 0$ [29]. The spin precession of an electron in an external electromagnetic field is described by the Bargmann-Michel-Telegdi (BMT) equation [30], which reads $\frac{dS^\mu}{d\tau} = \frac{e}{m_e c}[\frac{g_e}{2}F^{\mu\nu}S_\nu + (\frac{g_e}{2}-1)p^\mu\frac{S_\rho F^{\rho\nu}p_\nu}{m_e^2c^2}]$, where $F^{\mu\nu}$ is the electromagnetic field strength tensor, p^μ the momentum 4-vector, e the elementary charge, m_e the electron mass, c the speed of light (all in Gaussian units) and $g_e \approx 2$ the electron anomalous magnetic moment. According to the BMT equation, the component of the spin 4-vector S^μ, parallel to $u_\mu = (0, \frac{\boldsymbol{E}\times\boldsymbol{\beta}}{|\boldsymbol{E}\times\boldsymbol{\beta}|})$, is the only non-precessing spin basis for the configuration described above. We deal with transverse polarization, since $\boldsymbol{E}\times\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is perpendicular to $\boldsymbol{\beta}$.

Electrons tend to polarize antiparallel to the direction of $S^\mu u_\mu = \boldsymbol{S}\cdot\frac{\boldsymbol{E}\times\boldsymbol{\beta}}{|\boldsymbol{E}\times\boldsymbol{\beta}|}$ (i.e. $s=-1$), in order to minimize energy. Similarly, the spin-orbit effect in an atom causes the $j = \ell - 1/2$ fine structure level (of a hydrogen-like ion), in which orbital and spin-angular momentum couple 'anti-parallel', to have lower energy than the $j = \ell + 1/2$ level [31].

We may express the rate of gamma-ray photon emission by electrons or positrons as a function of two dimensionless parameters [22, 32]: the strength parameter of the electromagnetic wave $a_0 = eE/(cm_e\omega)$ and the quantum efficiency parameter $\eta = E_{RF}/E_S$, that determines the importance of quantum effects on electrons [1], where $E_S = m_e^2c^3/(e\hbar)$ is the Schwinger field [33], $\hbar$ is the Planck constant, ω the laser frequency and the suffix RF corresponds to the instantaneous rest frame. Indeed, for $a_0 \gg 1$ we may assume that the electromagnetic fields are constant over the small space-time interval in which the photon is emitted by the electron. The locally constant field approximation, combined with the fact that the electric field at the magnetic node is much less than the Schwinger field, permits the rate to be calculated in any given configuration of fields which has the same η [7, 14], e.g. a constant crossed field [32] or a static magnetic field [12].

The approximations above allows us to generalize Eq. (7.10) of Ref. [10], which was originally derived for constant magnetic fields $B_{\rm ST}$ [34]. We may replace $\eta = \gamma B_{\rm ST}/E_S \to \eta = \gamma E/E_S$. The rate of photon emission summed over photon polarization states now reads

$$\frac{dN^{ss'}}{d\tau} = I_{\rm class}\int_0^{\eta/2} d\chi \frac{dy}{d\chi}\frac{F(\eta,\chi,s,s')}{\hbar\omega/\gamma}. \qquad (2)$$

In our formalism $\chi = \hbar\omega E/(2m_ec^2E_S)$ is the photon quantum parameter, and s' (s) refers to the electron spin

[1] The ST effect has been been observed in storage rings [10], for which $\eta \sim 10^{-6}$ or less [44]. Next-generation high-intensity lasers are expected to reach more extreme regimes, in which $\eta \sim 0.1-1$ [28]. Same values of η can be also achieved in the interaction of relativistic particles with strong crystalline fields [36], as it has been experimentally observed [37].



(a) (b)

FIG. 2. Degree of electron spin polarization, (a) as a function of a_0 and time normalized to the typical high-intensity laser period $T \approx 3.33$ fs; (b) asymptotic values for $t \gg t_{\rm ST}$. The continuous line represents the full computation, while the dashed line represents the limit $a_0 \ll 560$, where the polarization is $\approx 92.4\%$.

projection in the final (initial) state. The classical intensity of radiation is $I_{\rm class} = 2m_e^2c^3e^2\eta^2/(3\hbar^2)$ and the gamma-ray photon energy is $\hbar\omega = \gamma m_e c^2 \xi y/(1+\xi y)$, with $\xi = 3\eta/2$ and $y = 4\chi/[3\eta(\eta - 2\chi)]$. The quantum synchrotron function $F(\eta,\chi,s,s') = 9\sqrt{3}y/[16\pi(1+\xi y)^4](F_{\rm nonflip}+F_{\rm flip})$ is composed of two terms accounting for photon emission without and with spin flip [2].

The different components of Eq. (2), as functions of η and normalized to the unpolarized rate for a single electron [3] $dN/d\tau = dN^{\uparrow\uparrow}/d\tau + dN^{\downarrow\downarrow}/d\tau + dN^{\downarrow\uparrow}/d\tau + dN^{\uparrow\downarrow}/d\tau$, have been plotted in Figs. 1a and 1b, respectively on linear and logarithmic scales, in order to emphasize differences. The probability of having a final spin aligned antiparallel to $\boldsymbol{E}\times\boldsymbol{\beta}$ ($dN^{\downarrow\downarrow}/d\tau + dN^{\uparrow\downarrow}/d\tau$) is higher than that of a final spin aligned parallel ($dN^{\uparrow\uparrow}/d\tau + dN^{\downarrow\uparrow}/d\tau$) due to the difference in the rates of spin flip. This means that the electron spin tends to align itself antiparallel to $\boldsymbol{E}\times\boldsymbol{\beta}$, after a particular time. In addition, we see that most gamma-ray photon emission happens without spin flip. Hence, unpolarized rate predictions are precise up to $\sim 5\%$: the fact that electrons spin polarize has a small effect on the total rate of gamma-ray photon emissions (but a bigger effect on the power radiated, as we show later). The spin polarization of electrons could have a strong effect on the degree of polarization of the gamma-ray photons, which could alter the rate of pair production. A full analysis of this effect is beyond the scope of this letter, while an investigation of photon polarization assuming unpolarized electrons has been performed in Ref. [35]. The relative importance of transitions involving spin flip [36–38] rapidly decreases with decreasing η. Therefore, for $\eta \ll 1$, the unpolarized behavior is recovered.

Equations (1) and (2) can be used to determine the polarization of the electrons in the magnetic node of the standing wave as a function of time. The solutions of Eq. (1), for the spin-up and down fractions of the electrons, assuming initially unpolarized electrons, are

$$\begin{cases} n^{\downarrow}(t) = n_0 \dfrac{\frac{dN^{\uparrow\downarrow}}{dt} - \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{dN^{\uparrow\downarrow}}{dt} - \frac{dN^{\downarrow\uparrow}}{dt}\right)e^{-t/t_{\rm ST}}}{\frac{dN^{\uparrow\downarrow}}{dt} + \frac{dN^{\downarrow\uparrow}}{dt}} \\ n^{\uparrow}(t) = n_0 \dfrac{\frac{dN^{\downarrow\uparrow}}{dt} + \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{dN^{\uparrow\downarrow}}{dt} - \frac{dN^{\downarrow\uparrow}}{dt}\right)e^{-t/t_{\rm ST}}}{\frac{dN^{\uparrow\downarrow}}{dt} + \frac{dN^{\downarrow\uparrow}}{dt}} \end{cases}, \qquad (3)$$

in the lab frame, where $n_0 = n^{\downarrow}(t=0) + n^{\uparrow}(t=0)$ is the total density of electrons, which is assumed constant in time. We also define the ST spin polarization time as $t_{\rm ST} = \gamma(dN^{\uparrow\downarrow}/d\tau + dN^{\downarrow\uparrow}/d\tau)^{-1}$. Thus, the degree of spin polarization of the electrons evolves as

$$\frac{n^{\downarrow} - n^{\uparrow}}{n_0} = \frac{\frac{dN^{\uparrow\downarrow}}{dt} - \frac{dN^{\downarrow\uparrow}}{dt}}{\frac{dN^{\uparrow\downarrow}}{dt} + \frac{dN^{\downarrow\uparrow}}{dt}}\left(1 - e^{-t/t_{\rm ST}}\right). \qquad (4)$$

Equations (2) and (4) are functions of η and γ. The latter can be computed accounting for the radiation-reaction force, by solving $\left[g(\eta)\,\omega\gamma^4\right]^2 + \gamma^2 = a_0^2$ [15]. The factor $g(\eta) \approx [1 + 4.8(1+\eta)\ln(1+1.7\eta) + 2.44\eta^2]^{-2/3}$ phenomenologically describes the reduction of the radiated power due to quantum effects [14], but without taking the electron spin into account. Complete spin polarization of the plasma can modify $g(\eta)$ up to 15%, since $g(\eta) \propto \int_0^{\eta/2} d\chi (dy/d\chi) F$ [7]. Nevertheless, the spin effects on $\gamma(\eta)$ should be small because it depends on $g(\eta)^2$.

[2] Respectively, $F_{\rm nonflip}(\eta,\chi,s,s') = \frac{1+ss'}{2}[2(1+\frac{1}{2}\xi y)^2\int_y^\infty K_{5/3}(x)dx + \frac{\xi^2y^2}{2}\int_y^\infty K_{1/3}(x)dx - s'(2+\xi y)\xi y K_{1/3}(y)]$ and $F_{\rm flip}(\eta,\chi,s,s') = \frac{1-ss'}{2}\,\xi^2y^2[K_{2/3}(y) - s'K_{1/3}(y)]$, with K as the modified Bessel functions of the second kind.

[3] Our $dN/d\tau$ is twice that defined in Refs. [7, 14], because two electron populations are involved (characterized by their polarizaton).

Equations (2) and (4) can also be extended for positrons by inverting the sign of s and s' [39]. Equation (4) provides information about the degree of electron spin polarization and about the characteristic spin polarization time $\sim t_{\rm ST}$. Figure 2a represents solutions of Eq. (4) as a function of time, normalized to the typical high-intensity laser period $T \approx 3.33$ fs, varying the laser parameter a_0. In addition, Fig. 2b plots the asymptotic spin polarization $\downarrow$ as after a time $t \gg t_{\rm ST}$. Both the dependence on a_0 and on $\eta(a_0)$ have been highlighted. We see that, for $\eta \ll 1$, the polarization approaches $\sim 92.4\%$, although the plasma will take a time much longer than typical laser pulse duration (tens of fs), to reach this level of spin polarization. Moreover, the spin polarization is not complete because of spin-orbital energy exchanges [10, 40] which become more important for increasing η (although, for $\eta \sim 1$, the degree of spin polarization is still $> 80\%$).

Figure 3 shows the ST time $t_{\rm ST}$, which Eq. (4) reveals to be the time required to reach the asymptotic polarization. It is shown normalized to the laser period $T \approx 3.33$ fs, as a function of a_0 or of a 1 μm wavelength laser intensity I_{24}, expressed in units of 10^{24} W/cm^2. For the case of two counter-propagating circularly polarized plane waves, the relation among them is $a_0 = 8.4 \times 10^2 \lambda_{\mu\rm m}\sqrt{I_{24}}$ [28] ($\lambda_{\mu\rm m} = 1$). The figure reveals that the polarization occurs on a very rapid time scale. Indeed two lasers of $a_0 \simeq 265$ (intensity $\sim 10^{23}$ W/cm^2) are sufficient to polarize the electrons in ~ 10 fs.

We may determine scaling laws by assuming that η is small. In this limit, the photon emission probability (2) becomes $dN^{ss'}/d\tau \approx (5\sqrt{3}/16)(m_e c e^2/\hbar^2)\eta^3[1 - s'(8\sqrt{3}/15)]$ [10]. Therefore, in the low η limit $t_{\rm ST} \approx 8/(5\sqrt{3})\hbar^2/(m_e c e^2)\gamma\eta^{-3}$. This expression for $t_{\rm ST}$ is shown in Fig. 3 by the dashed line. For $\eta \ll 1$, $\eta \approx 1.7 I_{24}\lambda_{\mu\rm m}$ and $\gamma \approx a_0$ [28], with 1 μm laser wavelength, giving $I_{24} \ll 0.46$. Thus, the time for electrons in the magnetic node of the standing wave to spin polarize can be parameterized in terms of the laser intensity as $t_{\rm ST} \approx 1.5(10 \times I_{24})^{-2.5}$ fs, in the limit $I_{24} \ll 0.46$ ($a_0 \ll 560$), demonstrating that the electrons spin polarize over the relevant femtosecond timescale for $I \gtrsim 10^{23}$ W/cm^2.



FIG. 3. Spin polarization time $t_{\rm ST}$, normalized to the laser period $T \approx 3.33$ fs, as a function of a_0 and laser intensity (for a 1 μm wavelength). The continuous line represents the full computation, while the dashed lines represent the limit $a_0 \ll 560$ ($I_{24} \ll 0.46$).

The spin magnetization of electrons in a plasma at the magnetic node, resulting from the spin polarization, can be deduced by multiplying Eq. (4) by $\mu_B n_0$ [41]. Assuming the plasma density is equal to the relativistic critical density (upper limit for laser propagation), the spin magnetization for 1 μm wavelength lasers of intensity $\gtrsim 10^{23}$ W/cm^2 is $M \sim$ kG, after $\sim 1 - 10$ fs.

In order for the electrons in a plasma at the magnetic node to spin polarize they must remain in this node for sufficient time subject to several constraints. The laser intensity must be sufficiently high that the ST spin polarization time $t_{\rm ST}$ (shown in Fig. 3) is less than the laser pulse duration. Typically the pulse duration is of the order of tens of femtoseconds and so this places a constraint on the required laser intensity of $I > 10^{23}$ W/cm^2 (for one micron laser wavelength). It has been shown in Ref. [42] that the orbit studied in this paper is unstable and that the electrons migrate to the node of electric field. The time scale for this process is of the same order as the wave frequency and, so, the time required to deviate the electron trajectory from that considered here is $t \sim T \approx 3.33$ fs, giving a stronger constraint on $t_{\rm ST}$ and the laser intensity required to induce spin polarization – the latter is therefore $I > 10^{24}$ W/cm^2. As the electrons migrate from the magnetic node they can experience a magnetic field parallel to their velocity. This mixes the spin polarization states but will not necessarily randomize them, due to the precession of the polarization basis $S^\mu u_\mu$– a full discussion of the precession is left as further work. We also note that in the fully quantum case ($\eta > 1$), the finite recoil experienced when the electron emits a photon (which is not exactly in the plane of the orbit) could expel it out of the magnetic node even more rapidly than the classical instability, and perturb the classically stable orbits.

As positrons tend to align themselves in the direction opposite to electrons, prolific pair creation could reduce the total polarization at very high intensity (although the electron and positron populations will themselves be spin polarized). Pair cascades become important rapidly as laser intensities exceed 2×10^{24} W/cm^2 [43]. We therefore predict spin polarization will be maximized at $I \sim 10^{24}$ W/cm^2. A full investigation of the effect of pair production on the degree of spin polarization is also left for future investigation.

In conclusion, we have shown that electrons spin polarize very rapidly under the action of a strong rotating elec-

tric field. In the case of two counter-propagating 1 μm lasers, an intensity $I > 10^{23}$ W/cm^2 is sufficient to 90% polarize electrons in about $1 - 10$ fs. This effect could be experimentally investigated with lasers which will be available in the near future and its measurement could be used to validate the quasi-classical approach, commonly invoked in describing this new regime of matter.

This work was funded by the UK Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EP/M018156/1) and by the Science and Technology Research Council (ST/G008248/1).

[1] S.-W. Bahk, P. Rousseau, T. Planchon, V. Chvykov, G. Kalintchenko, A. Maksimchuk, G. Mourou, and V. Yanovsky, Optics letters **29**, 2837 (2004).

[2] A. Macchi, M. Borghesi, and M. Passoni, Reviews of Modern Physics **85**, 751 (2013).

[3] A. Di Piazza, C. Müller, K. Hatsagortsyan, and C. Keitel, Reviews of Modern Physics **84**, 1177 (2012).

[4] G. Mourou, C. Labaune, M. Dunne, N. Naumova, and V. Tikhonchuk, Plasma Physics and Controlled Fusion **49**, B667 (2007).

[5] P. Goldreich and W. H. Julian, The Astrophysical Journal **157**, 869 (1969).

[6] R. D. Blandford and R. L. Znajek, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society **179**, 433 (1977).

[7] J. G. Kirk, A. Bell, and I. Arka, Plasma Physics and Controlled Fusion **51**, 085008 (2009).

[8] C. P. Ridgers, C. S. Brady, R. Duclous, J. G. Kirk, K. Bennett, T. D. Arber, A. P. L. Robinson, and A. R. Bell, Physical review letters **108**, 165006 (2012).

[9] N. V. Elkina, A. M. Fedotov, I. Y. Kostyukov, M. V. Legkov, N. B. Narozhny, E. N. Nerush, and H. Ruhl, Phys. Rev. ST Accel. Beams **14**, 054401 (2011).

[10] A. A. Sokolov and I. M. Ternov, Synchrotron radiation (Akademie-Verlag, Berlin, 1968).

[11] S. Belomesthnykh, A. Bondar, M. Yegorychev, V. Zhilitch, G. Kornyukhin, S. Nikitin, E. Saldin, A. Skrinsky, and G. Tumaikin, Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section A: Accelerators, Spectrometers, Detectors and Associated Equipment **227**, 173 (1984).

[12] T. Erber, Rev. Mod. Phys. **38**, 626 (1966), URL `http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/RevModPhys.38.626`.

[13] V. I. Ritus, J. Sov. Laser Res. **6**, 497 (1985).

[14] C. Ridgers, J. G. Kirk, R. Duclous, T. Blackburn, C. Brady, K. Bennett, T. Arber, and A. Bell, Journal of Computational Physics **260**, 273 (2014).

[15] P. Zhang, C. Ridgers, and A. Thomas, New Journal of Physics **17**, 043051 (2015).

[16] D. Seipt, T. Heinzl, M. Marklund, and S. Bulanov, arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.00633 (2016).

[17] T. Grismayer, M. Vranic, J. Martins, R. Fonseca, and L. Silva, Physics of Plasmas (1994-present) **23**, 056706 (2016).

[18] E. N. Nerush, I. Y. Kostyukov, A. M. Fedotov, N. B. Narozhny, N. V. Elkina, and H. Ruhl, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 035001 (2011).

[19] L. Ji, A. Pukhov, E. Nerush, I. Y. Kostyukov, B. Shen, and K. Akli, Physics of Plasmas (1994-present) **21**, 023109 (2014).

[20] W. Furry, Physical Review **81**, 115 (1951).

[21] A. I. Nikishov and V. I. Ritus, Sov. Phys. J. Exp. Theor. Phys. **19**, 529 (1964).

[22] V. Baier and V. Katkov, Soviet Journal of Experimental and Theoretical Physics **26**, 854 (1968).

[23] A. Fedotov, N. Narozhny, G. Mourou, and G. Korn, Physical review letters **105**, 080402 (2010).

[24] S. S. Bulanov, T. Z. Esirkepov, A. G. R. Thomas, J. K. Koga, and S. V. Bulanov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 220407 (2010).

[25] S. Bulanov, C. Schroeder, E. Esarey, and W. Leemans, Physical Review A **87**, 062110 (2013).

[26] M. Tamburini, F. Pegoraro, A. Di Piazza, C. H. Keitel, and A. Macchi, New Journal of Physics **12**, 123005 (2010).

[27] M. Marklund and G. Brodin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 025001 (2007), URL `http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.98.025001`.

[28] A. Bell and J. G. Kirk, Physical Review Letters **101**, 200403 (2008).

[29] B. King, Physical Review A **91**, 033415 (2015).

[30] V. Bargmann, L. Michel, and V. L. Telegdi, Physical Review Letters **2**, 435 (1959).

[31] B. H. Bransden and C. J. Joachain, Physics of atoms and molecules (Pearson Education India, 2003).

[32] V. Ritus, Moscow Izdatel Nauka AN SSR Fizicheskii Institut Trudy **111**, 5 (1979).

[33] W. Heisenberg and H. Euler, Zeitschrift für Physik **98**, 714 (1936).

[34] I. Ternov, Physics-Uspekhi **38**, 409 (1995).

[35] B. King, N. Elkina, and H. Ruhl, Physical Review A **87**, 042117 (2013).

[36] U. I. Uggerhøj, Reviews of modern physics **77**, 1131 (2005).

[37] K. K. Andersen, J. Esberg, H. Knudsen, H. Thomsen, U. Uggerhøj, P. Sona, A. Mangiarotti, T. Ketel, A. Dizdar, and S. Ballestrero, Physical Review D **86**, 072001 (2012).

[38] T. G. Blackburn, C. P. Ridgers, J. G. Kirk, and A. R. Bell, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 015001 (2014), URL `http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.112.015001`.

[39] V. B. Berestetskii, E. M. Lifshitz, and L. P. Pitaevskii, Quantum electrodynamics, vol. 4 (Butterworth-Heinemann, 1982).

[40] J. S. Bell and J. Leinaas, Nuclear Physics B **284**, 488 (1987).

[41] J. D. Jackson, Classical electrodynamics (Wiley, 1999).

[42] J. Kirk, arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.00822 (2016).

[43] T. Grismayer, M. Vranic, J. L. Martins, R. Fonseca, and L. O. Silva, arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.07503 (2015).

[44] S. Mane, Y. M. Shatunov, and K. Yokoya, Reports on Progress in Physics **68**, 1997 (2005).